



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20001-4413

**COPY MAILED**

**SEP 30 2009**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Patent No. 7,435,742	:	
Prat Quinones, et al.	:	DECISION ON
Issue Date: October 14, 2008	:	REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
Application No. 10/518,496	:	OF
Filed: September 19, 2005	:	PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
Attorney Docket No. 09605.0044	:	

This is a decision on the "POST GRANT APPLICATION FOR PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT," filed November 12, 2008, requesting that the patent term adjustment determination for the above-identified patent be changed from two hundred ninety-six (296) days to three hundred twenty-two (322) days. The petition will be treated under 37 CFR §1.705(d).

The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment is DISMISSED.

On October 14, 2008, the above-identified application matured into U.S. Patent No. 7,435,742 with a patent term adjustment of 296 days. This request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment was timely filed within two months of the issue date of the patent. See 1.705(d).

The Office acknowledges submission of the \$200.00 fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.18(e). No additional fees are required.

Patentees argue that the determination of 296 days is in error in that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §154(b) the Office failed to issue a patent within three years of the actual filing date of the above-referenced application in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.702(b) and failed to take a certain action within a time frame specified in 37 CFR § 1.702(a).

Patentees argue that the period of adjustment due to the Three Year Delay by the Office, pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.702(b), is 26 days. Patentees calculate this 26 day period based on the application having fulfilled requirements under 35 U.S.C. §371 on September 19, 2005, and the patent having not issued until October 14, 2008, three years and 26 days later.

Patentees are informed that the Three Year Delay period is triggered by the application's commencement date, not the 371 fulfillment date. The commencement date is 30 months from the priority date claimed in the international application, or earlier. The priority date claimed in the international application is June 21, 2002. Thirty months from that date is December 21, 2004. Accordingly, the period of adjustment under § 1.702(b) is 298 days, counting the number of days beginning on December 22, 2007 and ending on October 14, 2008 when the patent issued.

Patentees assert that in addition to the Three Year Delay period, they are entitled to a period of adjustment due to examination delay, pursuant to 37 CFR §1.702(a)(1) of 383 days for the failure by the Office to mail at least one of a notification under 35 U.S.C. 132 not later than fourteen months after the date on which the application was filed under 35 U.S.C. § 371. A non-final Office action was mailed on December 7, 2007, 14 months and 383 days after the application fulfilled requirements under 35 U.S.C. §371.

Under 37 CFR § 1.703(f), applicants are entitled to a period of patent term adjustment equal to the period of delays based on the grounds set forth in 37 CFR §1.702 reduced by the period of time equal to the period of time during which applicants failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution pursuant to 37 CFR §1.704. In other words, the period of Office delay reduced by the period of applicant delay. The period of reduction of 87 days for applicant delay is not in dispute.

Patentees assert that the total period of Office delay is the sum of the period of Three Year Delay (26 days per patentees' calculation) and the period of Examination Delay (383 days, not in dispute) to the extent that these periods of delay are not overlapping.

Patentees contend that no portion of the Three Year Delay period overlaps with the period of 14 month examination delay.

Considering the Three Year Delay period is properly calculated based on the commencement date and is 298 days (December 22, 2007 to October 14, 2008), not 26 days, patentees assertion of entitlement to a patent term adjustment is considered to be 594 days (298 + 383 reduced by 0 overlap - 87 for applicant delay).

As discussed above, the Office states that the patent issued 3 years and 298 days after the application's commencement date. The Office agrees that the action detailed above was not taken within the specified time frames, and thus, the entry of period of adjustment of 383 days is correct. At issue is whether Patentees should accrue 298 (per Office's calculation of the Three Year Delay Period) days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent, as well as, 383 days for Office failure to take a certain action within a specified time frame (or examination delay).

The Office contends that 298 days overlap. Patentees' calculation of the period of overlap is inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of this provision. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

to the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

Likewise, 37 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C.

154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See *Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule*, 65 Fed. Reg. 56366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See also *Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule*, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004). See also *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004).

The current wording of § 1.703(f) was revised in response to the misinterpretation of this provision by a number of Patentees. The rule was slightly revised to more closely track the corresponding language of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). The relevant portion differs only to the extent that the statute refers back to provisions of the statute whereas the rule refers back to sections of the rule. This was not a substantive change to the rule nor did it reflect a change of the Office's interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). As stated in the *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)

in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed. The grounds specified in these sections cover the A) guarantee of prompt Patent and Trademark Office responses, B) guarantee of no more than 3 year application pendency, and C) guarantee or adjustments for delays due to interference, secrecy orders and appeals. A section by section analysis of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) specifically provides that:

Section 4402 imposes limitations on restoration of term. In general, pursuant to [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(2)(A)-(C), total adjustments granted for restorations under [35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)] are reduced as follows: (1) To the extent that there are multiple grounds for extending the term of a patent that may exist simultaneously (e.g., delay due to a secrecy order under [35 U.S.C.] 181 and administrative delay under [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(1)(A)), the term should not be extended for each ground of delay but only for the actual number of days that the issuance of a patent was delayed; See 145 Cong. Rec. S14,718<sup>1</sup>

As such, the period for over 3 year pendency does not overlap only to the extent that the actual dates in the period beginning three years after the commencement date overlap with the actual dates in the periods for failure of the Office to take action within specified time frames. In other words, consideration of the overlap does not begin three years after the commencement date of the application.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the entire period from the application's commencement date through the date it matured into

---

<sup>1</sup> The AIPA is title IV of the Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999 (S. 1948), which was incorporated and enacted as law as part of Pub. L. 106-113. The Conference Report for H.R. 3194, 106<sup>th</sup> Cong. 1<sup>st</sup> Sess. (1999), which resulted in Pub. L. 106-113, does not contain any discussion (other than the incorporated language) of S. 1948. A section-by-section analysis of S. 1948, however, was printed in the Congressional Record at the request of Senator Lott, See 145 Cong. Rec. S14,708-26 (1999) (daily ed. Nov. 17, 1999).


Patent No. 7,435,742, December 21, 2004 to October 14, 2008.  
(There were no periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)).

383 days of patent term adjustment were accorded prior to the issuance of the patent for the Office failing to respond within a specified time frame during the pendency of the application. During that time, the issuance of the patent was delayed by 383 days, not 383 + 298 days. The Office took 14 months and 383 days to issue a first Office action. Otherwise, the Office took all actions set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.702(a) within the prescribed timeframes. Nonetheless, given the initial 383 days of Office delay and the time allowed within the timeframes for processing and examination and applicant delay, the patent issued, three years and 298 days after its filing date. The Office did not delay 383 days then an additional 298 days. The 298 days attributable to the delay in the issuance of the patent overlaps with the adjustment of 383 days attributable to ground specified in § 1.702(a)(1). Entry of both periods is not warranted.

Accordingly, at issuance, the Office properly entered no additional days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of 3 years to issue the patent.

In view thereof, the Office affirms that the revised determination of patent term adjustment at the time of the issuance of the patent is 296 days.

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to Shirene Willis Brantley, Senior Petitions Attorney, at (571) 272-3230.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nancy Johnson", with a large, stylized initial "N" and a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Nancy Johnson  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy